Feasibility analysis of flooding safety system of ATOM during early phase of accident by using MELCOR code

Speaker: Hyo Jun An

Advisor: Prof. Sung Joong Kim

Advanced Thermal-Hydraulic Engineering for Nuclear Application Lab. Department of Nuclear Engineering, Hanyang University

PRESENTATION DATE: 2022.10.21



LOCATION: Korean Nuclear Society Autumn meeting

CONTENTS

- Introduction
- Methodology
- Results and discussion
- Conclusion
- Future work



Introduction SMR and its safety





Locatelli, Giorgio, Chris Bingham, and Mauro Mancini. "Small modular reactors: A comprehensive overview of their economics and strategic aspects. Progress in Nuclear Energy 73 (2014): 75-85.



Introduction Passive safety system of SMR







NuScale SMR

- Thermal power 200 MWth
- 12 modules in a building
- ECCS, DHRS
 - \rightarrow Indefinite grace period



<u>ATOM</u>

- Thermal power 330 ~ 450 MWth
- 6 modules in a building
- <u>PRHRS, FSS</u>



Introduction Objective of flooding safety system









Introduction Concept of Flooding safety system





Introduction Validation of FSS

AHENA



Grace period with partial re-collection ratio



8

Introduction Objective



- 330 MWth ATOM MELCOR input model
- Estimate core uncovery time -

- Flooding safety system MELCOR input model
- Investigation of requirement of flooding path to prevent core damage





Methodology MELCOR nodalization of reference reactor





×6 modules in a plant building



Methodology MELCOR nodalization of FSS







Methodology Accident scenario





A HFNA

Methodology Flooding time simulation matrix

AHENA

*6 cavities flooding assumed





Results and discussion Core uncovery time

15 MPa

16 -

14

12

10

8

6

4

2 -

0

0.0

0.5

(MPa)

Pressure





Rapid RPV pressure decrease after the accident

1.0

Core water level started to decrease **1.05 hour** after

1.5

Time (hr)





Δίήγνα

Results and discussion

Cavity flooding time with valve flow area

Variable 1: flow area



- 1. Gradually decreasing flow rate
- 14 2. Inversely proportional flooding time to flow area

Linearly proportional flow rate to flow area \rightarrow **Inversely proportional flooding time**





Results and discussion

Cavity flooding time with valve flow area



15 Cavity water level with flow area of the valve

Flow area (m²)	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.08	0.1
Core level reached (hr)	0.81	0.40	0.27	0.20	0.16
Fully submerged (hr)	NA	1.68	1.11	0.83	0.67

- Flow area 0.02 & 0.04 m² \rightarrow insufficient flooding time
- Flow area 0.08 & 0.1 m² \rightarrow sufficient flooding time
- Flow area 0.06 m² \rightarrow closer investigation is needed!





Results and discussion

Cavity flooding time with the number of valves



Variable 2: Valve



Cavity water level with the number of valves

- Each valve has flow area 0.02 m²
- Approximately <u>0.01-hour delay</u> from the <u>identical</u> total flow area case
- Reason of the delay
 - \rightarrow <u>extra pressure drop</u> from smaller flow area

Flow area (m²)	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.08	0.1			
Core level reached (hr)	0.81	0.40	0.27	0.20	0.16			
Core level reached delay (hr)	NA							
Fully submerged (hr)	NA	1.69	1.12	0.84	0.68			
Fully submerged delay (hr)	NA	0.012	0.011	0.011	0.01			

→ <u>Replacement of single large valve with multiple</u> valves can be achieved



Conclusion Summary



Core uncovery time evaluation of 330 MWth ATOM ADS ventilation valve malfunction accident

Core uncovery at 1.05 hour after the accident



Flooding time with total flow area of valves

- \checkmark Total flow area larger than 0.06 m²
 - \rightarrow met the time limit
- ✓ <u>Multiplicity from multiple valves</u>
 → achievable!





Future work Integrated analysis of FSS short-term coolability







Thank you for your attention

E-mail: hjan97@hanyang.ac.kr

Appendix. A Safety system of NuScale and its limitation



NuScale passive safety system

2) NuScale Power, Status Report - NuScale SMR (NuScale Power, LLC), 2020.





Appendix. B Safety system of NuScale and its limitation



Long-term coolability

21

- Boiling induced by the decay heat
 → water level decrease
- Water depletion after 30 days
- 0.4 MWt is sufficiently low for air cooling
- → indefinite grace period



- Larger thermal power → lager CP inventory requirement
- Improvements required for <u>high-powered reactors</u>

) Reyes Jr, José N. "NuScale plant safety in response to extreme events." Nuclear Technology 178.2 (2012): 153-163.

2) Park, Jae Hyung, et al. "Lumped Analysis of Effective Long-term Coolability by Using Flooding Safety System for Small Modular Reactors." (2021)



Appendix. B Safety system of NuScale and its limitation





Additional limitations

- Heat loss to CP
- Difficult approach for management
- Inadvertent interfering effects of accidental module to others

Requirements to improve the system

- Separate and dry cavities during normal operation
- Additional passive safety system for <u>enhanced long term</u> <u>coolability</u>



Appendix. C Previous research on long-term coolability of FSS

AHENA

Lumped analysis for long-term coolability of FSS



Conclusion

- Higher re-collection ratio \rightarrow Longer grace period
- Indefinite grace period with collection ratio 1.0



Limitation

- Immediate flooding was assumed
- Insufficient flooding rate may result in core damage





Appendix. D Accident mitigation strategy



Accidents involving Overpressure of RPV



- RPV overpressure
- Reactor vent valves open
- Steam injection into the CNV



- Flooding of the cavity
- Steam condensation in the CNV
- Re-supply of the condensate into RPV through recirculation valves



- Boiling of cavity coolant
- Continuous coolant supply from condensation system



Introduction Objective of flooding safety system

A HENA



